Brock, S. P., *A Note on Luke ix. 16 (D)* , Journal of Theological Studies, n.s.:14 (1963) p.391

and Byzantine periods. There was evidently no inclination to archaize in this matter as the manuscripts show, and the tendency within the development of the language was to drop the initial vowel. It appears, then, that when this form is attested in the tradition there are good grounds for considering it as the primitive reading.

J. NEVILLE BIRDSALL

A NOTE ON LUKE IX. 16 (D)[1]

CODEX BEZAE CANTABRIGIENSIS (D) has always been, and still remains, an enigma. Recently, the subject of Semitisms in the 'Western' text in general, and in this manuscript in particular, has received a considerable amount of attention. Wellhausen was one of the first to bring to the notice of scholars the problem raised for New Testament textual criticism by the presence of direct (i.e. not via the Septuagint, etc.) Semitisms peculiar to the 'Western' text. In 1937 Wensinck[2] produced a formidable array of instances where, he claimed, D's text had a more Semitic colouring than did Wescott and Hort's so-called Neutral text. His position has been taken up notably by Black in his *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, and the deserved popularity of that book has achieved a wide dissemination of the view that the 'Western' text with its Semitisms represents an earlier stage in the history of the text of the N.T. than does the smoother text of B ℵ, &c.

Obviously the question is of vital importance: if D and its allies can really be shown to have a text more Semitic in character than other manuscripts, they will have a strong claim to be considered as possessing a text closer to the autographs than B ℵ, &c. The position of Wensinck and Black, however, has been strongly challenged by many scholars. For Acts, Haenchen[3] has made the timely observation that long ago Weiss, von Soden, and others had shown that many supposed Semitisms in D are in fact Latinisms, or merely due to the careless habits of the scribe. Likewise Yoder,[4] from a different point of view, has recently minimized the Semitic element in D.

[1] The writer is very grateful to Professor G. D. Kilpatrick for discussing his manuscript, and for some suggestions with regard to presentation. It is only fair to add that Professor Kilpatrick is not to be held responsible for any of the views here stated or implied.

[2] *Bulletin of the Bezan Club*, xii; cp. also *Mededeel. Akad. Amsterdam* (*Letterkunde*), 81A9, and the material published after his death by Black as Appendix C to his *Aramaic Approach* (2nd ed.).

[3] 'Zum Text der Apostelgeschichte' (*Z.f.Th.u.K.*, 1957), pp. 22 f.; cp. too his 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apg' (ibid., 1954), pp. 153 f., and more briefly in his *Kommentar*, pp. 41 f.

[4] 'Semitisms in Codex Bezae' (*J.B.L.*, 1959), pp. 317 f.

Copyright (c) 2003 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Oxford University Press

Brock, S. P., *A Note on Luke ix. 16 (D)* , Journal of Theological Studies, n.s.:14 (1963) p.391

Certainly the complexities of the problem are great, and require very careful handling. The following, however, should dispose of yet one more direct Semitism claimed for the text of D. Luke ix. 16 reads (Nestle's text) λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς. . . . D (with the old Latin^{pler} and Marcion[1]) reads εὐλόγησεν ἐπ' αὐτούς. In classical Greek εὐλογεῖν had the meaning 'speak well of, praise', while the development to 'bless' is very probably a lexical Hebraism.[2] The normal construction is with the accusative (sometimes with ἐπί+causal dative), or, less frequently, with the dative; consequently Wensinck[3] and Black[4] claim εὐλογεῖν ἐπί+ acc. in D here as (by implication) a direct Semitism, corresponding to the Hebrew and Aramaic ברך על.[5] Indeed, at first sight, the case seems a strong one. However, the isolated occurrence of εὐλογεῖν ἐπί (this time with gen.) 'pronounce a blessing over' in *original* Greek alters the situation. The passage in question occurs in the Ps.-Clementine Homilies:[6] (Peter) εὐλογήσας δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς τροφῆς καὶ εὐχαριστήσας μετὰ τὸ κορεσθῆναι. . . . It appears, then, that we are dealing with a technical expression for the blessing of food, current in Jewish Christian circles; an example, in fact, of that elusive phenomenon 'Jewish Greek'.[7]

If the intrusion of ἐπ' in the 'Western' text of Luke ix. 16 now be attributed to the influence of 'Jewish Greek' (no doubt subconsciously aided by the presence of the preceding -ϵN) the position becomes *toto caelo* different: a direct Semitism could with reason command respect in such a case, while a Jewish Greek usage merely points to the circles in which the text of D had its prehistory.

Many strata go to make up the 'Western' text as we now have it, and that it may contain much that is of value is not to be denied.[8] Semitisms, genuine or otherwise, form but one stratum; it is, however, on these

[1] Syr$^{sin, cur}$ (ܒܪܟ ܥܠ) should not be cited as witnesses for ἐπ' αὐτούς (as they are by Nestle) since ܒܪܟ ܥܠ is the normal usage in Syriac (Syr^{pe} here has simply ܒܪܟ ܒܥܕ). *ThWBNT*, p. 760, n. 31, is incorrect: Syr^{pe} is cited as witness for αὐτούς and Syr$^{sin, cur}$ for the omission of the object.

[2] Cp. R. Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta*, pp. ix, 18.

[3] *B.B.C.* xii, p. 17. [4] *Aramaic Approach*, p. 85.

[5] i.e. 'recite the blessing over', e.g. M. Berakhoth, vi. 1 (כיצד מברכין על הפירות 'What benediction do they pronounce over fruits?').

[6] i. 22. 4. I have been unable to trace any other example, though compare the non-classical use of ἐπεύχομαι 'pray over (food)' in Hippolytus's description of the Essenes (*Haer.* ix. 21): οὐ γεύεταί τις, εἰ μὴ ἐπεύξεται εὐλογῶν ὁ ἱερεύς. Cp. also *Test. Joseph*, vi. 7.

[7] Some other examples in Blass–Debrunner–Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, § 4, 3.

[8] Cp. the excellent use made of it by Zuntz in his Schweich Lectures, *The Text of the Epistles*.

Copyright (c) 2003 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Oxford University Press

Brock, S. P., *A Note on Luke ix. 16 (D)* , Journal of Theological Studies, n.s.:14 (1963) p.391

that hangs most of the reputation of this text. The whole question requires a thorough reappraisal, but it can already be said with certainty that the Semitic element in the 'Western' text is very much smaller than Black and others have tried to maintain. S. P. BROCK

JOHN IV. 51 *ΠΑΙΣ* OR *ΥΙΟΣ*?

AT John iv. 51 the printed editions have ὁ παῖσ, but ὁ υἱόσ is read by P^{66c} D L N U Y $_{f}13^{pt}$ 33 *al.* and the question arises: which is right? παῖσ occurs nowhere else in John. υἱόσ is frequent in the Gospel and is the term used elsewhere in this story except once in verse 49, where παιδίον occurs (cp. xvi. 21, xxi. 5). παῖσ, on the other hand, is employed in the parallel stories of Matthew and Luke (Matt. viii. 6, 8, 13, Luke viii. 7). This suggests that παῖσ in John is a harmonization to Matthew and Luke.

A further consideration is that, apart from this passage, παῖσ is absent from Mark, John, the Pastoral Epistles, and Revelation, texts which seem to constitute the lowest stratum of Greek in the New Testament. Indeed, Matthew and Luke–Acts are alone in employing the word.

G. D. KILPATRICK

ACTS XXIII. 23 *ΔΕΞΙΟΛΑΒΟΙ*[1]

IN this discussion we shall assume that δεξιολάβουσ, and not δεξιοβόλουσ A, is the right reading, even though A's reading may be supported by the Peshitta.

For the meaning of δεξιολάβοσ we must first consider the military evidence.[2] The account in Acts implies one tribune only in Jerusalem, Claudius Lysias, and this would again imply one cohort in the garrison at the time. With this would agree the fact that the procurator was at Caesarea.

Cohorts were of a nominal strength of either 500 men (*quingenaria*) or 1,000 (*miliaria*). The account in Acts makes it clear that whatever the size of the cohort it contained, apart from δεξιολάβοι, both infantry and cavalry. It is generally held that the cohort in question was *miliaria* and this is supported by the fact that to escort Paul at least 200 infantry and 70 cavalry were withdrawn from the Jerusalem garrison. This would have left about 200 effective troops in Jerusalem if the cohort were *quingenaria*, much too small a number. Even if the cohort were *miliaria*,

[1] Cp. Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*[5], 346b.
[2] See *Beginnings of Christianity*, v, Additional Note xxxiii.

Copyright (c) 2003 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Oxford University Press